

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claim 35, 38 and 40 are amended. Accordingly, claims 35, 36 and 38-41 are pending in the application.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 35, 36 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,127,117 issued to Sano et al. (hereinafter “Sano”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,388,682 issued to Ihara (hereinafter “Ihara”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0091158 filed by Miled et al. (hereinafter “Miled”).

Claim 35, as amended, recites the elements of “a second setting unit to set a plurality of image regions within the input image, one of the plurality of image regions set by said second setting unit having at least one aspect ratio and at least one size set by the first setting unit” (emphasis added). Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in Fig. 12A, 12B, 13A and 13B and the corresponding descriptions in the Specification. The cited references fails to teach or suggest these elements. On page 3 of the Office Action (see page 3, third paragraph), the Examiner has conceded that Sano fails to teach or suggest the elements related to the second setting unit as recited in claim 1. As a result, Sano fails to teach or suggest the above cited elements in amended claim 1 as well.

Moreover, Ihara fails to teach or suggest these missing elements. In the penultimate paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has characterized Ihara’s display controller that outputs an image of a particular image type having a defined image size, screen aspect ratio and pixel aspect ratio as being equivalent with the elements of “a first setting unit” and “a second setting unit” as recited in recited in claim 1. See Ihara, column 9, lines 53-58. In particular, the display controller is taught as managing control of setting an image size of an image display on a television device. However, the aspect ratio and the sized disclosed in Ihara are simply related to converting the input image so that the aspect ratio and the size are in accordance with the output device (or external device or system). For example, Ihara discloses conversion into the image type of the U.S. digital television broadcasting system or the image type of the PAL system.

On the other hand, as recited in claim 35, the elements of “a second setting unit” are to set the region of the input image depending on the aspect ratio and the size of the external device. In addition, the divided regions for the compression process are set by the “second setting unit” so that the boundaries of the divided regions subject to the compression process to match the boundaries of the image regions within the input image. According to these features, it is possible to reproduce the image while the aspect ratio and the size of the input image are unchanged, by decoding in the external device only the codes in the portions in accordance with the aspect ratio and the size of the external device.

Therefore, Ihara is does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in amended claim 35 in that Ihara converts the input image itself to match the aspect ratio and the size of the output device. This difference also applies to Miled cited by the Examiner. The Examiner has not cited and Applicants are unable to discern the portion of Miled that allegedly teaches or suggests the missing elements in amended claim 35.

Thus, in view of at least the foregoing reasons, Sano in view of Ihara in further view of Miled fails to teach or suggest each element in amended claim 35. Moreover, dependent claim 36 is patentable over the cited art because this claim depends on claim 35. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35 and 36 are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claims 38 and 40, these claims have been amended to recite analogous elements to those discussed in connection with amended claim 35. Thus, the cited art fails to teach or suggest each element of amended claims 38 and 40 for at least the reasons discussed in connection with amended claim 35. Further, dependent claims 39 and 41 are patentable over the cited art because each of these claims depends on either base claims 38 or 40. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38-41 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 720 8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10/27, 2008

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800



Michael J. Mallie Reg. No. 36,591

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on October 27, 2008.



Angela Quinn

10-27-08
October 27, 2008